

Application No.: 09/919113

Case No.: 56904US002

Remarks

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to their representative during the interview of February 5, 2004.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicant has amended claim 2. Support for the amendment to claim 2 is supported at p. 6, lines 23-26 and at p. 19. The Applicant contends that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to recognize good roll stability and thus such language is not indefinite. As an alternative, Applicant's representative agreed to cancel this claim in the event that mutually agreeable claim language is not reached.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 11-14, 19-20 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/14281 in view of JP 59-149970 and Kessel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,432,006).

Claims 9-10, 15-18 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/14281 in view of Kessel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,432,006) and further in view of Rega et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,054,208).

Since claims 21-28 have been cancelled, the rejections applied to such claims are now moot.

As for the remaining pending claims, it has been previously argued with regard to WO 99/14281 that thermal contraction is not equivalent to shrinkage. This position is explained in Applicant's patent application on p. 7, lines 10-12. In addition, Applicant's patent application includes data that supports this position at pp. 23-24.

With regard to JP 59-149970, it has been previously stated that JP 59-149970 concerns a tacky paper used for electrostatic copying, magnetic copying, and for general office use. This reference concerns the expansion and shrinkage of paper due to humidity in the environment.

Application No.: 09/919113

Case No.: 56904US002

In contrast as described at p. 7, lines 1-10, in the present invention "shrinkage" refers to a "sheet or film that exhibits a (1-L/LO) of greater than 0.05% at 10 days according to Shrinkage Test Method B." Note that Shrinkage Test B, nor the Roll Stability test involve humidity cycling as described on p. 3 of JP 59-149970. Rather the humidity is held constant (i.e. at 90% RH) and the temperature is changed.

Although Claim 1 has been amended to include the definition of shrinkage to clarify this distinction, as yet another distinction Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the **substrate consists of polymeric material**, whereas new Claim 44 recites **retroreflective sheeting** rather than substrate. Both independent Claim 1 and 44 also recite a **polymeric liner**. Support for these amendments and Claim 44 is found throughout the specification such as at p. 9, line 12+; p. 13, lines 11-15; and original Claim 15.

Reconsideration and a timely allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

2-26-04
Date

By: Carolyn A. Fischer
Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091
Telephone No.: (651) 575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833